

The Committee of Inquiry met at 10 a.m., June 23rd with Mr. E. K. Morris and Mr. Phillips of the Board of Trustees and Professors Reuben Wood, Wolfgang Kraus and J. Forrester Davison were present.

(The Secretary left the room and return at the time the following question was asked:)

Q. We would like to understand the thinking of the Board.

A. Mr. Morris said it would not be a complicated matter as far as he was concerned. All he knows is that he was invited to attend a meeting between the Faculty Committee and the Committee appointed by the Board of Trustees about a week or ten days before (apparently the selection of President Elliott). He is not now nor never has been a member of the Committee (Special Committee of Trustees). Mr. Ellison asked him to attend the meeting. There was considerable discussion about the President of Bowdoin College who was a very fine academic man and a great scholar but the Faculty Committee said he did not have the personality for this position here (even granted he was a great scholar). The Trustees Committee apparently agreed he was a great scholar. Dr. Elliott was brought up and the report of the Faculty Committee seemed to be very favorable at that point and they wanted to get some closer contacts and ideas and they were going to do that the next week.

Q. This was the usual practice? Did you understand this was the usual practice?

A. "I would say yes." Mr. Morris said the only discussion was of what took place at this meeting.

Mr. Phillips interjected that there was no discussion of the justification for the meeting in Maine. It was just accepted.

The next meeting, Mr. Morris said, was about a week later after Professors Schmidt and Brown had been to Maine. The other meeting was approximately June 4 and they made a report at this meeting. Dr. Brown represented the Faculty and he stated that there had been a resolution passed that they would not recommend him (Dr. Elliott). There was a discussion of what had been done in Maine and the reasons for their adopting these resolutions. We asked questions. Mr. Morris asked two: How was his association with the students? Excellent. And the other was of special interest to the Trustees (about legislature, etc.) They said he was outstanding. Not in those words perhaps. Mr. Morris believed that the Trustees Committee announced they were going to meet on June 5 and they would be happy to meet with the Faculty after the meeting and announce what their decision was, if the Faculty wished. There was a meeting then on Saturday morning at 11 o'clock.

Mr. Phillips stated they were invited to attend that meeting.

Mr. Morris said the meeting took place and the Trustees Committee announced that they were going to recommend to the Trustees that we elect Elliott.

Q. Was there any mention of the fact that the Faculty wished to attend the Board meeting or send its representatives?

A. Mr. Morris said someone asked him and brought up the question would it be possible for the Faculty Committee to appear before the Board of Trustees. He said he thought it would be very unusual and he had no authority to say anything. "Well, anyway, as you know, they did appear. Dr. Brown and Professor Schmidt."

Q. In addition to their adverse reports, were the reports of the deans read to the Board or maybe summaries of these?

A. Mr. Morris said he did not recall that at all. Mr. Brown had reported to the Trustees Committee the day before.

Q. We are quite familiar with the report and the fact that the Board received it with great sympathy. Dr. Brown's report was received with applause?

A. Mr. Morris and Mr. Phillips said they had no recollection of the applause.

Q. Through the Acting President, did you hear read any letters of the Deans?

A. I do not recall any letters after the Faculty Committee members spoke.

Q. It would be surprising if all these reports were not made known to the Trustees?

A. Mr. Morris said he received so many reports, he did not recall from whom they all were. He said the Faculty was given every conceivable opportunity and they were very thorough in all their communications - first, through the Trustees Committee and then through the Trustees themselves. The Trustees were anxious to get all the information they had. There was no question of any lack on the part of the Board to communicate.

Q. To what extent did the Board evaluate this information. There were certain aspects of how John A. Brown was appointed. They (the Trustees) were subjected to many things that they had never heard before?

A. Mr. Morris said they certainly were.

Q. We are curious about the reaction of other members of the Board to the Faculty Committee reports.

A. Mr. Phillips said the Committee (this committee) seemed to be in an entirely different area. These are not matters of fact. The Faculty Committee and Dr. Brown and Mr. Schmidt had a very good opportunity to present their views to the Committee, then they presented their story over to the full Board. Presumably there was ample time for them to talk to the Committee. These facts weighed in the minds of the Trustees.

Dr. Kraus spoke about the fact that the Board's decision seemed to be unanimous for Dr. Elliott. The decision was clearly one that would cause the candidacy of Mr. J. A. Brown not to be taken seriously any longer.

Q. It is extremely important to understand more clearly some of the positive factors that caused this unanimous decision. What were Mr. Phillips own reactions?

A. No reply recorded. (Mr. Wood stated at this point that the committee had to write a report and outline the facts and make some sense of them)

Mr. Morris said that in Dr. Brown's talk he was quite impressed by the fact that Dr. Brown alluded to the fact that he would certainly go along with the decision of the Board and furthermore he (Dr. Brown) thought his own presence at the meeting was important because it showed a desire on the part of the Trustees to be closer to the Faculty.

Mr. Phillips said this may have been when he (Dr. Brown) received the applause.

Mr. Morris was impressed that Dr. Brown stressed he was impressed by the very fact that he was there (indicating a need for more cooperation between the Board and the Faculty.)

Mr. Davison agreed there was every indication of great communication. One wonders he said why they felt they were not appreciated. We are trying to find some channel so there will be no further lack of understanding between the Faculty and the Board of Trustees?

Mr. Phillips said some members of the Board Committee were very concerned about the damage which had been done by leaks of information to the newspapers. He said he thought this sort of thing was most regrettable.

Professor Kraus said that he had heard there were reporters around the campus. He had met someone who told him that the reporter had already been told about Courtland Perkins and that this person had tried to convince the reporter not to use this in a story.

Mr. Phillips said basically, with a view to further communication between faculty committees and board committees, matters like the could be dangerous unless they could be kept confidential. The article he was thinking of had some of what we had discussed that day.

Mr. Kraus said they had asked Mr. Ellison for an interview around May 10 or thereabouts, because of many reports they had heard about attitudes taken by members of the Board and to clarify if there was a campaign in support of Mr. John A. Brown. I pointed out to Mr. Ellison that such an assumption was a mistake and if such a thing was a fact that responsible people would disassociate themselves. The faculty would resent it.

The strong support given to Mr. Brown was something which gradually came to a head, Mr. Kraus stated, when it was obvious it was not easy to find someone. The faculty had been increasingly impressed with Mr. Brown's vigor, ability and very unusual-to-establish human relations with members of the Faculty and, "though I was not aware of it, with the students. The President of the Student Council said the students were troubled about the presidency. When Mr. Kraus asked why, he said because the students knew who should be President. When I asked "Who", Mr. Kraus said, he said Mr. J. A. Brown because he, unlike others in the Administration, has shown unusual interest in student activities, puts in an appearance, etc.

Mr. Morris asked to interrupt and said he had received a copy of a letter written to Dr. Elliott (apparently from the President of the Student Council although Mr. Morris did not say this) which said that many had felt very strongly in favor of Vice President Brown but since Dr. Elliott's election and the various developments thereafter, they wanted him to know that the student body was 100% behind him and there is more than one person who could be President. He mentioned the fact that the students were fond of Mr. Brown.

Mr. Phillips said that Mr. Gnehm could not and did not know any other candidates under consideration.

Mr. Kraus said before he saw Mr. Ellison, he had run into Mr. Gnehm in the street and he was anxious to talk to him. He wanted him to know that he had seen Mr. Ellison about the presidency. Mr. Kraus asked how the meeting was arranged and Mr. Gnehm said that when he had his previous meeting with Mr. Ellison and other members of the Board, Mr. Ellison said he could feel free to arrange to speak to him. He talked about Mr. Brown and Mr. Ellison said they had given careful consideration to Mr. Brown but that he did not really measure up - but not to worry, as they were going to get a good man. They would consult persons in the White House about this. Mr. Kraus said he brought this up to Mr. Ellison who said he said nothing at all about Mr. Brown but merely talked about the presidency with Mr. Gnehm.

Mr. Phillips suggest that there could be a lack of communication here. Before the election of Mr. Elliott, Mr. Phillips had been asked to meet with the students. He said he met some fine youngsters. He was extremely proud of them and in the course of their discussion he talked about the need for communication so that facts are known as facts and not received via the grapevine. He met with Mr. Gnehm at lunch. Dr. Ellison is normally a very discreet man and Mr. Gnehm is too nice a boy to have made

this up. The Trustees were very impressed with him. Mr. Gnehm probably read something into the thing that never had existed.

Mr. Kraus then described ways in which leakages of information had come to him. He said there were multiple opportunities for leakages in interviewing people about candidates etc.

Mr. Phillips said that since such interviews must go on, he would not look upon these things as leakages of information.

Mr. Kraus told of some other occasions of interviews revealing information in various ways.

Mr. Phillips said that having been on the Board and not a member of the Special Committee, he did not know how far they had progressed. He remembered people calling him quite late - in fact within the last few weeks - to suggest people they thought would be excellent candidates. Former graduates of the School. He simply passed them on to Mr. Ellison. He did not personally talk with any such candidates.

Q. When we imply haste in choosing a candidate, we mean that until Dr. Elliott appeared, or up until the 12th of May, Mr. Brown appeared to be a serious candidate.

A. Mr. Phillips said he knew nothing about it.

Q. We have the impression there was a lot of resentment to the presentation of the name of John A. Brown.

A. Mr. Morris stated that he thought it was obvious to everybody that everyone wanted to "wrap it up" but there are very responsible people on the Board who were not going to just get someone to get him under the wire.

Q. The Faculty Committee felt that things were much more fluid than they actually were at that time.

A. Mr. Morris said they would not know anything about it as neither of them was on the Committee.

Q. This question related to the document "Basic Considerations etc." prepared by the Deans and now being used by the University Objectives Committee for its own report and whether or not it had been transmitted to the Board of Trustees and shown to Dr. Elliott.

A. Mr. Phillips said this was never in the period of his participation. He came in late. He knew of no pre-judgment at all.

Q. The relevance of this document is that it was prepared under the leadership and strong motivation of Mr. Brown. It is a strong piece of evidence of what he has been able to do within the University in the matter of leadership. The fact of access to this has much bearing on decisions which the Board of Trustees might take on several matters.

A. Mr. Phillips said perhaps "they were looking at it as a campaign document."

Q. A letter dated June 3rd is reported to have been sent by the Chairman to members of the Board asking their support of their candidate at the meeting. If this letter exists, can you tell us about it?

A. Mr. Morris said he did not recall such a letter. It might be in his file.

Q. We understand that three members of the Board did not get this letter?

A. Mr. Morris said if the Chairman did write such a letter, he would be very much surprised.

Mr. Phillips stated that there was nothing in any communications that were surreptitious the selection of Dr. Elliott. He felt that the Board of Trustees would not resort to any "negative shift ?" They were favorably impressed and their selection was not motivated by any negativism. He was honored to be a member of the Board and extremely proud of it.

Mr. Kraus explained the sequence of events which lead to Mr. Brown's having been appointed Dean of Faculties as he recalled them and as they might have affected the Board's feeling toward Mr. Brown's candidacy.

Mr. Morris stated that he did not think it had any bearing on the matter at all. At a routine meeting of the Board, Mr. Brown was brought up by President Carroll. The only possible objection anyone could have had was that it might have seemed a little hurried, but it had no bearing on this matter at all.

Mr. Wood said that it seemed to him it would have been nice to have a man recommended by both Committees. This was not impossible to arrive at as they had Courtland Perkins. He offered three possible explanations:

- A) The Trustees did not think it very important that the Faculty should approve him.
- B) The Trustees did not feel that the Committee to Advise and Consult in the Selection of a President truly represented the Faculty.
- C) Although the Board had a high regard for faculty approval and believed the Committee to Advise and Consult was the true faculty spokesman, there was some urgent reason to elect this man contrary to the Advisory Committee's recommendations.

A. Mr. Morris stated in the first place (A) this was a ridiculous statement and nothing could be more ridiculous! Naturally it is very important that all elements be agreeable to it.

Q. You do want a consultation process then?

A. I can't understand how it could be otherwise. Mr. Morris stated that in the second place (B) he assumed that the Committee to Advise and Consult had been elected by the Faculty Assembly and was the official and actual representative of the Faculty in this matter. He did not know of any reason why it should not be.

Q. Were you confused by one of the presentations at the Board meeting? (Reference is made to Schmidt-Brown presentation.)

A. Mr. Morris said he was not confused because he had heard it before.

Q. One of the members of the Faculty Committee said he was quite confused.

A. Mr. Phillips said he was thinking of the second meeting. I believe with Mr. Morris that some of the things that were raised with regard to the visit to Maine were things he would think of as "reaching a bit." They seemed to be small things. This was Mr. Phillips own reaction.

There is a confusion of questions here and some remarks about "damaging the image of the University" which the secretary could not follow.

Mr. Morris then stated that if one did not feel strongly about the University one would not serve on the Board of Trustees. They receive no compensation, much time is consumed, much travelling must be done, etc. Regardless of what a situation is, there should be no doubt of the Board of Trustees loyalty to the University.

Mr. Phillips stated with regard to urgency (C) that he was convinced that they had found the man and he was convinced that they were right. He thought he was a fine man and would make a very effective President. The Board had many other sources of information. Aside from the written information, they had information from business associates, student reactions to him, etc. Mr. Phillips final conclusion was that they had found the man we should have.

Q. Should you not have waited to come to a meeting of the minds on it?

A. Mr. Phillips stated that the need for the man should not be allowed to drift.

Q. We are hopeful we can participate in making his arrival pleasant. We have heard Dr. Elliott intends to come down on July 15. What happens then? Do we lose the Dean of Faculties and have to start again?

A. Mr. Morris said that those matters will have to be referred to the new president. He will be here the 19th, 20th and 21st. He would like to have a full introduction to the campus.

The selection was a matter of the judgment of a group of people. There was no other way about it. There was nothing done to exclude the faculty from this decision. He feels the Faculty had every opportunity to participate.

They did not select him because they had to have someone quickly. The Faculty representatives went to Maine, came back, had their meeting, had another meeting in the morning with the Trustees at 11 o'clock. There was hardly time to go to work selling him to the Faculty at that point. If we had not gotten him then, we would have had to wait until October.

Q. You should have tried to explore the question of qualifications at that point with the members of the Faculty. Given a sort of priority, the good relations of the Trustees and the Faculty is given a lower priority when the functions of the new president depend to a great extent upon the president's relations with the faculty. We refer to the publicity in the way of editorials by Washington Post and Washington Star. We have been asked by students whatever caused the contemptuous position taken by the Board toward the Faculty and echoed in these editorials. Is The George Washington University run in such a way that automatic decisions are made by the Board to the contrary recommendations of the Faculty? We are referring to the case of an article written in Portland, Maine by the educational reporter with a by-line "Washington D. C." The implication is that this man was not allowed to present this article in his own community?

A. Mr. Morris said he thought all these things were most unfortunate, but they do not control them. Mr. Morris stated he thinks we have a very "restless" situation here as a result of a "care-taker" situation. The University cannot go anywhere or do anything.

Mr. Kraus said the Faculty Committee thinks differently. The question about Dr. Elliott is a question of policy. Dr. Elliott is a man who had done effective work in a different sort of institution and in different circumstances -- land grant institutions. He has devoted much effort to boosting the number of students but not as much time to research. Our problem is quite obviously

Mr. Phillips interjected that he thought Dr. Elliott recognized this fact.

(There was some discussion here about the University working under a system where the "books must balance" constantly.

Q. Mr. Davison said he hoped the Faculty can get to see the report, "Basic Considerations etc.," and that the new President can also.

A. Mr. Morris stated he thinks Dr. Elliott should have all the facts. In reply to Mr. Kraus, Mr. Morris is very aware of the differences in a man from Maine. He said it would be very difficult to get someone here that precisely fit into the picture. We feel the talents he used at Maine can be used here or in the same way. The Board thinks he demonstrated something at Maine, at Cornell, West Virginia, etc. Whatever he did, he made a definite step upward, and all the way along has been a very successful person. He thinks there is no question at all about him from an academic standpoint. He is the right age, etc. and in a reasonable time will be recognized as a very fine President. Mr. Morris thinks it is time for the University ~~all~~ to give him all the support he needs. "We should support him 100%, until sometime when he demonstrates otherwise."

Q. He seems very negative to us?

A. Mr. Morris said they would have to meet him to judge.

Q. We understand he has a 10-year contract.

A. Mr. Morris said he had no information about any contract, and Mr. Phillips said he did not recall the details. Mr. Morris said there had been no change in the figures etc. regarding salary.

Mr. Phillips stated that Maine is a different situation than The George Washington University, but that Dr. Elliott is a West Virginian and he had adapted very effectively to Maine and to its legislature. It is evidence of his ability to meet problems. He can therefore recognize that he has to adapt to this situation.

Q. There is a strong suggestion of rather autocratic action, etc.

A. Mr. Phillips said that living with people you learn these things. If he turns out to be this sort of person, you deal with it. One of the things that the Faculty Committee spoke of strongly is that he has an excellent manner of self-expression.

Q. How can the Board and the Faculty work out better relationships?

A. Mr. Morris said we gave every member of the Board a chance. There was enthusiastic response as well as unanimous response. He does not think there is any basis for criticism of Dr. Elliott until he has been here. We all met him. We think he has the characteristics and the character we need here. The circumstances were such that we had to make this decision. We would have had to postpone his election until the Board met again in October if we had not. I think he will prove himself.

Q. We hope we can meet again as this committee is charged to ask questions about the football and salary things.

A. Mr. Morris said the Board would welcome the opportunity to hear them on any subject within any sort of reason. They want to be close to the Faculty. There is room for improvement. They don't always understand each other. Mr. Morris said that you can't tell him that with a Faculty which is outstanding, and students like Mr. Gnehm that much cannot be accomplished if everyone pulls together.

(Mr. Morris told an anecdote about Mr. Sawyer of Williams College who had once told him that when Mr. Sawyer was talking to someone from the Ford

Foundation, this person said that what was needed was a great national university and that The George Washington University was the one that logically lent itself to such development)

Therefore, Mr. Morris said, he thinks this is the opportunity for everyone to push it along and help it out. If you do not have this sort of communication, you have all sorts of ideas which develop into nothing.

Mr. Wood commented that he was reluctant to introduce an adverse observation, but it should be pointed out that although most of the discussion this morning has suggested that communication between the Board and the Faculty Committee was quite good with respect to the presidential selection, the outcome of the selection process has resulted in an important and most undesirable manifestation of unhappy relations and feelings between Faculty and Board. Just communication does not seem to be a sufficient basis for good relations, mutual respect and understanding.

Mr. Morris said there may, of course, be differences of opinion. It is very unfortunate to have people feel humiliated.

Mr. Phillips said the University had had to go through two phases recently; getting President Carroll, then having him die at the height of his promise, and then having to start all over again.

Mr. Phillips said he had seen the newspaper stories. There was no down-grading in any member of the Board's mind of the role of the Faculty groups.

Mr. Morris thought it was a very good idea to arrange a schedule for Dr. Elliott to meet the Faculty. Informed that the 19th, 20th and 21st of July were bad days for the Faculty as it was examination time in summer school, Mr. Morris said he would be glad to reach Dr. Elliott and see if a week earlier or later would be convenient for him.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Foundation, this person said that what was needed was a great national university and that The George Washington University was the one that logically lent itself to such development)

Therefore, Mr. Morris said, he thinks this is the opportunity to everything to push it along and help it out. If you don't have this sort of communication, you have all sorts of ideas which develop into nothing.

Mr. Morris said there may of course be differences of opinion. It is very unfortunate to have people feel humiliated.

Mr. Phillips said the University had had to go through two phases recently: getting President Carroll, then having him die at the height of his promise and having to start all over again.

Mr. Phillips said he had seen the newspaper stories. There was no down-grading in any member of the Board's mind of the role of the Faculty groups.

Mr. Morris thought it was a very good idea to arrange a schedule for Dr. Elliott to meet the Faculty. Informed that the 19th, 20th, and 21st of July were bad days for the Faculty as it was examination time in summer school, Mr. Morris said he would be glad to try to reach Dr. Elliott and see if a week earlier or later would be convenient for him.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

6 July 1965

Dear President Colclough:

The attached is a transcript of the notes taken on June 23rd when you were interviewed by Professor Wood's Committee. They are to be used only for the internal affairs of the Committee, and will not be attributed to you in any report without your permission.

If you care to delete anything, add anything, or correct anything, please do so and return to Mrs. Brosnan, Registrar's office, marked Personal please.

Mrs Brosnan - Personal
Returned with
my notes

Ruth B Brosnan
Ruth B. Brosnan
Secretary

The Special Committee of Inquiry met on June 23rd in Acting President Colclough's office for the purpose of receiving his account of the facts in the matter of the selection of a new president against the recommendations of the Special Faculty Committee. Professors Reuben Wood, Wolfgang Kraus and J. Forrester Davison were present.

President Colclough recounted the following:

In his role and function as Acting President he met all the individuals invited to the University and spent considerable time with them both before and after they saw other people. It was the same role he had played after the retirement of President Marvin. Very often the person asked to come back to see him after they had visited with everyone else. He feels he is as conversant with the University as a whole as anybody, academically, financially, etc. One thing he did ~~not~~ say is that he reported to the Board of Trustees Committee through the Chairman of the Board on each person because all were not really ~~every~~ top candidates. In reporting these meetings, he did include reports from Deans. He felt this present Committee should talk with the Deans and Chairmen. He arranged in each case for the visitor to meet with the deans in a group and in each case, they submitted a report on their actions.

Q. Did the deans actually function as a group?

A. No, as individuals. I ~~got~~ ^{received} an individual memorandum from each of them. They sent a memorandum in each case. In the case of Dr. Elliott the actual memoranda were sent to Mr. Ellison.

The only other factual thing President Colclough stated he had to report was that he found Dr. Elliott eminently qualified and so reported. He met him around the middle of May. He found him in the top group.

Q. One of the strongest suggestions we have had is that we would be obliged to get the affirmative elements in Dr. Elliott's case. As an ex officio member of the Board of Trustees, could you tell us something about Dr. Elliott?

A. President Colclough said that if it would be of any use to this Committee, he would like to mention that Mr. Berg, Public Relations Director, has a whole file on Elliott. (Among the very best of which was the news item in the Portland Times Herald)

He stated he found Dr. Elliott most impressive, based on his experience particularly at Cornell. He liked his knowledge of the challenge there appeared to be at this University as a private, non-sectarian institution in the Nation's capital, and his appreciation of this fact; his understanding of how a University President should function vis à vis the faculty, vis à vis the Board of Trustees. He said Dr. Elliott expresses himself extremely capably. He has the art of self-expression.

Q. In this connection, how do you explain the fact that from what we can make out and have heard presented by two members of the Board over the months (including Mr. Ellison) the Board was certainly determined to seek someone for this position who would be a man of national reputation, considerable eminence, both professionally and academically. These particular criteria do not, I think, apply to Dr. Elliott?

A. He is nationally known in my book. I think he has many qualifications.

The Special Committee of Inquiry met on June 23rd in Acting President Colclough's office for the purpose of receiving his account of the facts in the matter of the selection of a new president against the recommendations of the Special Faculty Committee. Professors Reuben Wood, Wolfgang Kraus and J. Forrester Davison were present.

President Colclough recounted the following:

In his role and function as Acting President he met all the individuals invited to the University and spent considerable time with them both before and after they saw other people. It was the same role he had played after the retirement of President Marvin. Very often the person asked to come back to see him after they had visited with everyone else. He feels he is as conversant with the University as a whole as anybody, academically, financially, etc. One thing he did ~~not~~ say is that he reported to the Board of Trustees Committee through the Chairman of the Board on each person because all were not really ~~every~~ top candidates. In reporting these meetings, he did include reports from Deans. He felt this present Committee should talk with the Deans and Chairmen. He arranged in each case for the visitor to meet with the deans in a group and in each case, they submitted a report on their actions.

Q. Did the deans actually function as a group?

A. No, as individuals. I ~~got~~ ^{received} an individual memorandum from each of them. They sent a memorandum in each case. In the case of Dr. Elliott the actual memoranda were sent to Mr. Ellison.

The only other factual thing President Colclough stated he had to report was that he found Dr. Elliott eminently qualified and so reported. He met him around the middle of May. He found him in the top group.

Q. One of the strongest suggestions we have had is that we would be obliged to get the affirmative elements in Dr. Elliott's case. As an ex officio member of the Board of Trustees, could you tell us something about Dr. Elliott?

A. President Colclough said that if it would be of any use to this Committee, he would like to mention that Mr. Berg, Public Relations Director, has a whole file on Elliott. (Among the very best of which was the news item in the Portland Times Herald)

He stated he found Dr. Elliott most impressive, ~~based on~~ ^{+ referred specifically to} his experience particularly at Cornell. He liked his knowledge of the challenge there appeared to be at this University as a private, non-sectarian institution in the Nation's capital, and his appreciation of this fact; his understanding of how a University President should function vis à vis the faculty, vis à vis the Board of Trustees. He said Dr. Elliott expresses himself extremely capably. He has the art of self-expression.

Q. In this connection, how do you explain the fact that from what we can make out and have heard presented by two members of the Board over the months (including Mr. Ellison) the Board was certainly determined to seek someone for this position who would be a man of national reputation, considerable eminence, both professionally and academically. These particular criteria do not, I think, apply to Dr. Elliott?

A. He is nationally known in my book. I think he has many qualifications.

Q. One member of the Board stated that he certainly hoped the new President would be someone so widely known that normal people from Chatanooga to Portland would recognize his name. I said it did not seem that important. But why did this lose its importance to the Board?

A. President Colclough said he would not comment on this. He said it would not help the Committee in gaining any facts. He would merely say he had found Dr. Elliott eminently qualified as a University President.

Q. Have you any idea when he will be coming to the campus?

A. He will be coming in the middle of July. The President has talked with him numerous times. He will arrange a schedule for Dr. Elliott to meet representative groups of the faculty. He has made it clear that he wishes President Colclough to do so in order that his visit will be as meaningful as possible.

Q. Has President Elliott seen the copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Faculty on June 7, 1965?

A. The President has sent him all kinds of material just as they had done to President Carroll.

Q. Did President Elliott know of the recommendations of the Faculty Committee when he received the offer?

A. You will have to ask the Trustees about that.

Q. Would you see if Dr. Elliott has received the Faculty Assembly minutes?

A. I shall look into it.

Q. Has the dean's report been sent to him? (Reference is made to the report which the Committee on University Objectives is using for its own report. It is entitled "Basic Considerations Underlying an Academic Plan")

A. No, the Committee is not finished using this report.

Q. Do you have any suggestions or proposals for improving the Board of Trustees-Faculty relationships which we feel are less than we would like to have them be?

There was some clarification of the question here but the secretary did not record it about "differences of opinion" and "lack of mutual respect"

A. This is hard to comment upon, the President said. The President referred the Committee to the statements of Mr. Morris (new Chairman of the Board of Trustees) about improving communications at the University. He stated that the particular problem in this matter under discussion was not, however, a matter of lack of communication in his opinion.

Q. Differences of opinions in so many things should be watched. The Faculty thought that the Trustees did not want someone unacceptable to them. Perhaps we pushed too hard for one candidate?

A. In this connection, the President thought it was the committee's business to find out the facts about communication with members of the faculty assembly and the Board. He said that, as the Committee of Inquiry well knew, there had been considerable communication between the Faculty Assembly (as apart from Deans and Chairmen) and the Faculty Assembly elected a Committee to Advise and Consult with the Board of Trustees on the Selection of a President. Also, as this Committee well

Members of

knew, there had been considerable communication not through their own Committee. Many members of the Board of Trustees had received long distance calls from members of the Faculty directly.

The Committee also knew, President Colclough remarked, about petitions sent to the Board of Trustees ~~in writing~~ by people not on the Selection Committee.

Q. Why was it thought necessary, or even desirable, to make the appointment of Dr. Elliott at this time and not wait any longer.

A. The President stated that he would have to say that any member of the Board of Trustees would express this differently. His own feeling was that the Board of Trustees agreed completely with their own selection committee that they had found the man.

(There were some off-the-record remarks here)

Q. Did the Board of Trustees take the Faculty Committee seriously?

A. Many members of the Faculty were expressing opinions not through their own Committee. I never had any dealings with the Committee except with Dr. Brown personally. The Faculty Committee never consulted me at all.

Q. We would like to bring up as a fact that a number of students have come to members of the Committee and expressed their deep concern at the tone of the editorial comments in the two leading papers in this city. If it signified anything, it tended to indicate a kind of depreciation and contempt for the value of a faculty committee. This has raised many questions in view of the fact that it is well-known that members of the Board are closely related to these newspapers. Far from advancing the welfare of the University, this sort of attitude detracts from the image of the University. To what extent is there some sort of understanding of this problem among the Trustees?

A. I don't know who wrote the editorials. The head of a newspaper, however, is not held responsible for its editorials.

Q. How do you account for these editorials?

A. I can't throw any light on it. They had me over a barrel. I told Mr. Robinson of the New York Times that his story was factually not so.

Q. The thing that depresses us was that the editorials did not reflect what the newspaper stories said?

A. Yes.

Q. There was a very extensive news story published in the Sunday edition of the Washington Star, but the most comprehensive story was published not in Washington but in Maine. Why was it not published in the Evening Star? (Apparently a story by Mr. John Matthews).

A. There were two stories published in the Star. The first one just after the Faculty Assembly meeting. This mentioned that the meeting ~~was~~ "acrimonious." I told them this was in error right after it appeared in the paper. He wanted to get it into the late edition of the Star he said. The next evening it was completely different in the Star. The best story appeared in the Portland Sunday Star on Sunday, June 13th, 1965.

Q. What can be done to make the atmosphere on the campus better when President Elliott comes down? One of the facts rated highly by accreditation groups is good relations between the faculty and the Board of Trustees. The Middle States will be coming in

the near future. (President Colclough said they would be coming in 1967). What can we do to improve faculty-trustee relationships?

A. President Colclough said he did not fully understand this question in view of the fact that there was extensive communication between the Faculty and the Trustees recently, but they reached different conclusions.

Q. The Faculty feels humiliated in these circumstances?

A. The President stated he wanted to be as helpful as he could. He had stated his own opinion of Dr. Elliott. That is the only fact he had to offer. The Resolution calls for the committee to ascertain the facts only.

Q. Communication is all very well and this Committee believes there is a fair amount of it. Most of the time there was, but it was a formalized sort. Here was the Committee of the Board and here was the Faculty Committee. Everything went to or through the Chairman of the Board (There was some statement of a different type of faculty-trustee committee working well at Haverford or Swarthmore with the two parties cooperating toward a single goal or function and contrasting this with The George Washington University faculty-trustee relations as "confrontation and exchange.")

A. The President said he could not comment on the above. It was "theorizing" He mentioned that Dr. Brown spoke highly of communication between the Committees (the Faculty Committee and the Board Committee) in one of the Interim Reports to the Faculty ~~Assembly~~.

Q. Some of the members of the Faculty's elected Committee have accused some lawyers on the Board Committee in these transactions of having been "deliberately deceived" by them.

A. The President stated that Dr. Brown did not seem to feel that way. The Committee never consulted President Colclough. He never took a position. He did not say anything before the Faculty Assembly.

Q. We are distressed that we cannot have Mr. Ellison answer any questions.

A. The President ~~agreed~~ and stated that Mr. Ellison is out of town on an extended trip.

The President then reiterated that he wanted to continue to be as helpful as possible to the committee. He stands ready to do this because he believes it is his function to get the University in the best shape possible in the shortest possible time for Dr. Elliott's arrival.

Q. We are looking toward your judgment. How would you suggest we talk to the two members of the Board tomorrow?

A. The President would suggest that perhaps the approach they had taken this morning in getting the facts from the members of the Board would be the best and then go into the area of the important backdrops later as they had done with him. He said he had given the facts in his role as Acting President and tried to be as helpful as he could be.

The meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.